THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

22 May 1987

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 16 April 1987 minutes

B. Dates of next meetings:

19 June 1987 (Friday)
24 July 1987 (Friday)

C. Reappointment of Hugh C. Miller, FAIA, to Old Georgetown Board

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. United States Holocaust Memorial Council

CFA 22 MAY/87-1, The Holocaust Memorial Museum, between 14th and 15th Streets, S. W., south of Independence Avenue and the Auditors Building. New concept design.

B. American Red Cross

CFA 22/MAY/87-2, Red Cross Headquarters, 17th and E Streets, N. W. Proposed new parking lot, revised concept design.

C. Office of Personnel Management

CFA 22/MAY/87-3, proposed new seal for the Office of Personnel Management.

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 87-83, Corcoran Gallery of Art, 530 17th Street, N. W. Proposed addition, revised concept design.

b. S.L. 87-89, Duke Ellington Bridge, Calvert Street over Rock Creek Park. Proposed retention of suicide barriers constructed across bridge.

c. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 87-59, 1600 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Concept design for a two-story residential/ retail building.

b. Appendix II.

E. District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development

CFA 22/MAY/87-4, 7th and Water Streets, S. W. Proposed new restaurant, revised design.

F. Department of the Army

CFA 22/MAY/87-5, Ft. Myer, Virginia. Design for new hay barn.

G. Department of Health and Human Services

CFA 22/MAY/87-6, Hubert Humphrey Building, 3rd Street and Independence Avenue, S. W. Proposed installation on plaza of sculpture by Chaim Gross.

H. (Unscheduled) National Park Service, National Capital Region

Discussion of White House area bollards and paving.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-88	1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Atlantic Freeholds	New paving and doors

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacement doors with bronze trim and non-illuminated sign, and for replacing concrete walk pavers at entrance area.

S.L. 87-90	1440 New York Avenue, N. W. Washington Building Limited Partnership	Garage entrance

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new garage door to match existing metal trim. No other work is visible and no signs are hereby approved.

S.L. 87-91	2938 Macomb Street, N. W. Reuben Aaronson	Addition and deck

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition and deck as shown in drawings received and dated 1 May 1987 subject to zoning conformance.

S.L. 87-92 (See S.L. 87-73)	3017 Oregon Knoll Drive, N. W. Oregon Knoll Limited Partnership	New single family house

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revision to approved plans. (See S.L. 87-73.)

S.L. 87-93 (See S.L. 87-74)	3019 Oregon Knoll Drive, N. W. Oregon Knoll Limited Partnership	New single family house

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revision to approved plans. (See S.L. 87-74.)

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-94 (See S.L. 86-80, S.L. 87-82)	3100 Macomb Street, N. W. Washington International School	New school building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of new building according to working drawings (received and dated 7 May 1987) which conform to previously approved concept submissions. See previous Actions (S.L. 86-80 and S.L. 87-82).

S.L. 87-96	1440 New York Avenue, N. W. Washington Building Limited Partnership	Paving

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for continuation of matching paving through walk area and installation of 6' apron.

S.L. 87-97	4550 Broad Branch Road, N. W. Don Dailey and Tom Sakowski	Addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition as shown in drawings received and dated 14 May 1987.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-73	1301 36th Street, N. W. Holy Trinity School	Window replacement

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for window replacement, with exception of windows above 36th Street entrance and at O Street auditorium elevation. These windows should be redesigned to more closely match existing. Request submission of new drawings for review prior to installation of these windows.

O.G. 87-77	2500 Q Street, N. W. Gateway Georgetown Codominium	Remove existing planter

ACTION: Returned without action. Applicant has decided to repair existing planter, according to letter received 27 March 1987, a copy of which is attached.

O.G. 87-81	1033 31st Street, N. W. Yes, Incorporated	Addition

ACTION: WITHDRAWN by request of applicant.

O.G. 87-87	1423 36th Street, N. W. Finnerty residence	Addition and renovation - Conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept design. Size and height of proposed addition are proportionally too large for the existing historic house. The intrusion into rear yard open space in this block of the historic district is also potentially excessive and the character of the proposal, which is visually as important as the front of the house, is not appropriate.

O.G. 87-88 (See O.G. 86-172)	3025 P Street, N. W. Moore-Mottershead residence	2-story addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new 2-story addition based on working drawings which conform to concept previously approved by Commission.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-89	1736 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Moskos Nomikos	Addition to commercial building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of third floor to rear wing as shown in drawing received and dated 8 April 1987. New brick will match existing.

O.G. 87-90	1226 36th Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Cellar addition and exit stair

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for entrance and basement addition. Note is made that paved surfaces shall be finished with brick.

O.G. 87-92	1321 35th Street, N. W. Kevin Schlossberg	Sign - temporary

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed large sign mounted on building, particularly over windows. Proposed sign is out-of-character with historic building and historic district.

O.G. 87-96	2820 P Street, N. W. Walters residence	Sundeck

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit because this proposal would alter the design of one of several identical porches in this historic row. Note that the Board recommends against any further alterations from the original configuration in this block of houses.

O.G. 87-97	2624 Dumbarton Avenue, N. W. First Baptist Church	Fence

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new fence at existing areaway.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-98 (See O.G. 87-66)	2914 P Street, N. W. John Hedden	Deck stairs

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed roofdeck stair, which would be visible from public space, adversely affecting appearance of historic house. Recommend consideration of metal spiral staircase located midway back from edge of roof.

O.G. 87-101	2803 M Street, N. W. Mary H. Chase	2-story elevator addition - Conceptual

ACTION: WITHDRAWN by request of applicant.

O.G. 87-102 (See O.G. 87-11)	1402 31st Street, N. W. Miller residence	Renovation - Revised

ACTION: No objection to issuance of revised permit for alterations to rear entry stair design.

O.G. 87-103 (See O.G. 86-174)	1529 33rd Street, N. W. Zimmerman residence	Dormer window addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new dormer window which conforms to design and recommendations previously approved by Commission (O.G. 86-174).

O.G. 87-105	1527 30th Street, N. W. Yerkes residence	Window replacement

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for window enlargement in this location. Proposed configuration at top floor will match that of existing paired window at first floor, and is the basis of this approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 87-107 (See O.G. 87-23)	1513 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Angela Porter	Storefront alteration

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for new storefront design. Character of existing storefront merits retention and preservation. See previous Action (O.G. 87-23).

O.G. 87-109	1421 36th Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Site alterations

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed site alterations, including relocating stairs within areaway and removing existing stoop to house.

O.G. 87-110 (See O.G. 87-27)	1242 34th Street, N. W. Hines residence	Additions and alterations

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit.

O.G. 87-111	3021 Q Street, N. W. Kenney residence	New windows

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new bathroom windows as submitted; also for replacement of garden wall at alleyway.

O.G. 87-100	3021 Q Street, N. W. Kenney residence	Basement entrance alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed enlargement of existing basement entrance to accomodate new French doors as shown on supplemental drawing.

O.G. 87-36	1236 Potomac Street, N. W. Morgan O'Brien	Addition and renovation Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design based on supplemental drawings received and dated 2 April 1987. Submit final working drawings for review prior to issuance of permit.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TOUR

22 May 1987 - 8:30 a.m.

Start Commission of Fine Arts, 708 Jackson Place, N.W.

INSPECT: 1) Duke Ellington Bridge, (Calvert Streets over Rock Creek Park).

2) Red Cross Headquarters, (17th & E Streets, N.W.).

3) Corcoran Gallery of Art, addition site, (New York Avenue, N.W., west of 17th St.

4) Holocaust Memorial Museum site, (between 14th & 15th Streets, between Auditors Bldg. & Bureau of Printing & Engraving).

5) Bollard mock-up, (If ready), (Pennsylvania Ave., nr. 17th, NW).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202–566–1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

22 May 1987

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. after an inspection tour of project sites by the members.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Neil Porterfield, Vice Chairman Hon. Carolyn J. Deaver Hon. Roy Goodman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue A. Kohler Mrs. Elizabeth Hannold, Historian Intern
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Robert Gresham

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 16 April 1987 minutes was unanimous.

B. Dates of next meetings were set at Friday, 19 June 1987 and Friday, 24 July 1987.

C. Hugh C. Miller, FAIA was unanimously reappointed to the Commission's Georgetown Board for a three year term.

D. Elizabeth Hannold was introduced by the Secretary who said that she would be with the Commission for several months working on a special history project. She was welcomed by the members.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. United States Holocaust Memorial Council

CFA 22/May/87-1. The Holocaust Memorial Museum, between 14th and 15th Streets, S.W. (Between the Auditors Building and the Bureau of Engraving Building). The Assistant Secretary told the Commission that a substantially revised design for this new building adjacent to the monumental core was about to be presented. He recalled that the Commission had previously reviewed a different concept design on 15 May and 28 June 1985 resulting in a preliminary approval. He also noted that the members had spent considerable time studying the site and surrounding views of it earlier in the morning. He then introduced the new director of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, Mr. Arthur Rosenblatt.

Mr. Rosenblatt said he thought that the scheme to be presented was extraordinary, and noted that it had been unanimously approved by the Holocaust Council and found to be deeply moving by the staff. He then introduced Mr. Albert Abramson, Chairman of the Museum Development Committee and a member of the Council; Mr. James Freed, the design architect; Mr. Morton Finegold, the associated architect; and Bob Hannah, the landscape consultant.

Mr. Freed then told the Commission that the architects had been commissioned to design a building that would fit into Washington and to reduce its size from the previous concept. He talked about taking the limestone from the Bureau of Engraving Building on the south and the brick from the Auditors Building to the north and tying the setbacks and heights together to fit into a context of much different character buildings on each side and the monuments to the west. He showed that the design included a hexagonal mini-monument facing west which broke the building line in an effort to lend design distinction and tie into the monumental core. He stated that there was a concern about possibly having a building that could be mistaken for an office building. There was some general discussion as the architect described the design with a model and drawings and an indication that Auditors Annex 3 could be demolished, (on the corner of 15th and Independence Avenue, N.W.) and that some peripheral park and street planting would enhance the urban design of the general area. The Commission agreed with the demolition and additional planting as being generally enhancing to the area. There was then additional general discussion about the proposal as it would be viewed from different directions, leading to a question about how far the hexagonal element projected west beyond the building line of the Bureau of Engraving Building. There followed discussion about traffic movement and the number of annual visitors. Senator Goodman asked a number of questions about visitor flow through the facility and entrance points. Mr. Freed and Mr. Rosenblatt described typical movement through the building. Miss Wolf asked about parking and was told that there would be none. She also asked about underground construction. Mr. Abramson said that about 40% of the building's 250,000 square feet would be underground.

Mr. Porterfield then stated his concern about the west projection of the building and how it would probably not be an irresolvable problem to pull back the projection more into line with the Bureau of Engraving. Senator Goodman then expressed his feelings about the gravity of the memorial message and his confidence in the collective judgment of the Council and the architects. He expressed his willingness to vote to approve the design, although he had some reservations about the projection beyond the building line and the design of the monument. Mr. Hart said he had a feeling of ambivalence about the monument element and its urban design consequences. Miss Wolf then asked some question about how the entrance areas and arcades worked and would be closed off after hours. Mrs. Deaver then indicated some concern about the entrance expression and the difficulty of combining a monument and a museum. She suggested that in her opinion it would be possible to combine these two personalities successfully by moving the building back off 15th Street. Mrs. Deaver felt the design was powerful enough to be significant if set back farther.

Mr. Rosenblatt indicated that the functions of the museum would be impaired by chopping off a bay or arbitrarily shortening it. He was seriously concerned about having the functional aspects of the museum impaired by arbitrary design changes. Mr. Hart recommended against falling into a trap of having the design review body dictating how to solve design, or functional, problems. He suggested that the Commission had clearly raised some issues about the placement and spirit of the building. Mr. Porterfield joined him in those concerns and felt that part of the set back question was exacerbated by the uncertainty of whether or not Annex 3 would be retained. The Chairman added that it seemed this was part of the problem and that the Commission could support removal of Annex 3.

At this point the Chairman called for comments from the public. Mr. Werner Hasenberg got up and presented a statement objecting to the construction of the Holocaust Memorial Museum on the Mall and the notion of permitting generous donors to have elements of the project named after themselves or their designees. His feeling was that if there was to be a national museum it should be dedicated to the memory of the millions of nameless Holocaust victims. Though the Commission was in receipt of other negative comments in written form, there were no other members of the public present who wished to make statements.

In conclusion, the Chairman said that there was not a sense of approval, which he regretted because of the great efforts which had obviously gone into the design. He suggested that it was easier to change lines on paper than live with something that everyone was not sure of and proud of. Added study might avoid something that all would regret later. With that Mr. Hart made a motion, and Mr. Porterfield seconded it recommending additional study along the lines discussed. The vote was unanimous.

EXHIBIT A

B. American Red Cross

CFA 22/May/87-3, Red Cross Headquarters, 17th and E Streets, N.W. Proposed new parking lot, revised concept design. Mr. Carson introduced the discussion by saying that this was a revised design. The Commission had rejected a similar surface parking scheme in April 1986 because of its elimination of landscape area and visibility in the monumental area. The proposal to expand the number of parking spaces for volunteers working at the Red Cross included the new lot which would be slightly recessed and surrounded by a masonry and landscape screen wall, and the widening of the front drive to accommodate parking on both sides. He then introduced the Architect, Mr. John Samperton who introduced Mr. Boyle, a Vice President of the Red Cross.

Mr. Boyle pointed out that his organization was one of the largest volunteer organizations in the world and that the parking was critical to their successful operation. He said that one feature of the plan would be to put gates at the front drive to discourage entry by persons not approved for parking there. He said that the Red Cross had revised its proposal to accommodate advice previously given by the Commission.

Mr. Samperton then presented his designs saying that the new lot would hold 18 cars; he described it as submerged from five to seven feet and screened with a granite railing and evergreen plant material. There would also be a widening of the front drive by five or six feet, and it would be closed to the public by means of security gates to stop the problem of unauthorized parking. Mrs. Deaver asked him how many parking places the entire scheme would have and he replied that the additional 26 spaces would bring the total up to 95. Mr. Porterfield then indicated that he liked the proposed parking lot with its retaining and perimeter walls less than the previous scheme. Mr. Porterfield also said that he felt the parking lot ought not to come out to the building line, but should be set back, if allowed at all, to spare the large tree which would be removed by the eastern end of the proposed lot. Miss Wolf also pointed out the proximity of the proposal to the Ellipse and commented that the Red Cross Building and its landscaping were an extension of the monumental parkscape of the city.

There was some additional discussion, with the Chairman adding that he was not troubled by the double row of parked cars along the front drive. There was discussion of placing some of the parking in a reorganized space in the center of the complex of three buildings and reducing the size of the lot along E Street. Concern was expressed that some very attractive landscape could be threatened by added parking in the center of the complex, but it was thought that it would be worth additional study, along with a reduced parking area screened by hedges along E Street. Mr. Samperton asked the Commission if they objected to security gates at the 17th Street drive entrances. The Commission generally felt that they were out of character with the building and the location. They would give the drive the appearance of a parking lot

rather than a drive. The Chairman suggested that mechanical gates would not be the solution, but that some type of ornamental fence and gate could be considered. With this Mr. Samperton suggested that they would return to the Commission of its July meeting. EXHIBIT B

C. Office of Personnel Management

CFA 22/May/87-3, Proposed new seal for the Office of Personnel Management. Mrs. Kohler presented the design saying it was a very simple design by the Institute of Heraldry and had been circulated to the members ahead of the meeting. The Chairman stated that the design appealed to him and that using an eagle and a star led to a handsome design. Miss Wolf expressed concern that the lettering might be too forceful, but it was decided that size reduction would eliminate that problem. The seal was unanimously approved. EXHIBIT C

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. SL 87-83, Corcoran Gallery of Art, 530 17th Street, N.W. Proposed addition, revised concept design. Mr. Atherton asked Mr. Cox, the architect, if he wanted to show some slides as the materials for the presentation were being set up before the Commission. The chairman observed it looked as though the architects had done exactly as the Commission had previously suggested. Mr. Cox said that they had made several changes to the design for the Corcoran addition which materially improved it, following the suggestions of the Commission. Mr. Cox then went on to describe the scheme in comparison to the two previous submissions. After a brief discussion there was unanimous approval of the revised design. EXHIBIT D

b. SL 87-89, Duke Ellington Bridge, Calvert Street over Rock Creek Park. Proposed retention of suicide barriers constructed across bridge. Mr. Myer said that the Commission had been sent advance material on the project which was before them because of a civil action. He recalled that the Commission had originally been brought into the design for the barriers to help mitigate their appearance on this attractive and geometrically simple structure. The Commission had expressed appreciation for being able to assist in the design process, but said that it did so with reluctance. In the meantime the barriers had been erected and seen by a great many people who felt they seriously detracted from the appearance of the bridge and the views of Rock Creek Park from the bridge. Organized citizen opposition had led to a law suit which resulted in the City being directed to follow procedures, similar to those for historic districts, in the review of such a project. They were ordered to go through the process after the fact in this case. Thus it has been referred to the Commission of Fine Arts as though it were private property in the Shipstead-Luce Act area. A similar process would follow on other historic bridges. Mr. Myer then said that two days before this meeting,

CORCORAN GALLERY OFFICE BUILDING

HARTMAN - COX ARCHITECTS

© 1987 HARTMAN - COX ARCHITECTS

MAY 6, 1987

Approved scheme

SL 87-83

S.L. 87-83 Corcoran Gallery
Office addition

the District of Columbia Preservation Review Board had met in full public session and recommended against retention of the suicide barriers. He then introduced Messrs. Birch, Cohen, and Grant from the Department of Public Works of the D. C. Government. Mr. Birch said that Mr. Myer had covered most of the highlights. They had returned as one of the steps required by the civil action. Mrs. Alicia Boyd then spoke as a private citizen saying that she was pointing out to the Commission that this re-airing of the project was in part a result of "great weight" not being given to the ANC opposition to the barriers. She expressed surprise that there was no ANC representation at the Commission meeting. The Chairman then called for a motion and Mr. Porterfield moved to oppose retention of the barriers and also to oppose any further installations. Mrs. Deaver seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously. EXHIBITS D, D-1

c. Appendix 1 was approved after some general discussion. [The Commission then changed the order of the agenda because representatives for the next project were not yet present.]

F. Department of the Army

CFA 22/May/87-5, Ft. Myer, Virginia. Design for a new hay barn. Mr. Myer presented a map of the post showing the proposed traditionally styled brick hay barn in relation to existing Army stables and exercise yards on the periphery of the historic fort. He recalled the Commission's visit to the vicinity about a year before and then showed a series of aerial photos and the design drawings. He said that there were also slides showing the site if the members wanted to see them. The Chairman said he did not think the slides would be necessary and asked the other members if they did not think it was a rather nice barn. There was additional discussion followed by unanimous approval. EXHIBIT E

G. Department of Health and Human Services

CFA 22/May/87-6, Hubert Humphrey Building, 3rd Street and Independence Avenue, S.W. Proposed installation on plaza of sculpture by Chaim Gross titled "Family at Play." Mrs. Kohler passed out photographs of the sculpture and the site saying that it was a bronze piece donated by the artist. There was some discussion as the Commission was shown where and how the piece would be installed; the members were told that existing sculpture on the other side of the plaza would be left in place. The Chairman commented that the Commission was always recommending that public art be included in building plans, and he said this piece was of the same period as the building and so would be particularly appropriate. He specifically asked if the Commission was being asked to comment on the quality of the art. Mr. Atherton told the members that they were really being asked about the propriety and the location. The Commission unanimously approved placing the sculpture at the proposed location.

[At this point, 12:37 p.m., the Commission left the room for lunch. They returned at 1:10 p.m.]

D. (Continuation) District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. OG 87-59, 1600 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Concept design for a new two-story residential/retail building. Mr. Myer presented drawings and a model for a proposed building on a then vacant site on the corner of Q Street and Wisconsin Avenue. He said that the Georgetown Board had reviewed the project several times during which the design had been modified and coordinated with the ANC, and several neighborhood objections had been accommodated by the developer. The concept was before the Commission with the Board's recommendation for approval subject to some additional study of polychrome and treatment of several blind windows on the first story.

David Cox, the architect, presented the design and showed how it would blend into the existing rows of buildings. He then described the design and its orientation for service off of Wisconsin Avenue rather than from the more residential Q Street. Mr. Porterfield and the Chairman then asked a number of clarifying questions and indicated an interest in the window panel articulation, feeling it needed more study. With that proviso, the Commission unanimously approved the project. EXHIBIT D

b. Appendix 2. The Secretary noted that the Commission was in receipt of three letters from the ANC questioning several items on the appendix. He then asked the Commission if they would like to go over the items and the Chairman agreed:

1) OG 78-110, 1242-34th Street, N.W. Alterations and additions to Hines residence. The Appendix reported the recommended action of the Georgetown Board as, "No objection to issuance of permit." Mr. Myer reported that the Board had reviewed the matter several times and recommended some changes to the design which altered the building less and reduced the profile of the addition, which was quite modest. The Board had inspected the property and felt that the proposals were quite reasonable and within the guidelines for additions, though several adjacent neighbors objected to the project as it backed up to their rear yards. The architect, Sharon Washburn, said that the house had some serious structural problems, and the building inspector had directed the repair and alteration to proceed and given a partial permit to begin work. The concept designs had been approved by the Board, there was a time limit on the Commission's action, and work was underway. The working drawings conformed to the concept and were certified as unchanged by the architect, who reported that the owner had met with some of the neighbors and was considering some modification to the design, which would be applied for in a separate permit application - if there was an agreement.

The project was presented with drawings and photographs. Julia Miller, the attorney representing the adjacent property owners, was introduced. The design was generally discussed and Miss Miller confirmed

that there was contact between the applicant and the concerned neighbors. There was some discussion about how a possible reduction in the side profile of the addition could be accommodated. The Chairman said that it was unlikely that in negotiation all parties would get all they wanted, and added that a good deal of time and consideration had gone into the project. He suggested the Commission return the item to the appendix and approve it.

2) OG 87-36, 1236 Potomac Street, N.W. Addition and renovation of Morgan O'Brien residence. The Chairman recalled that the Commission had discussed this project at its April meeting. The Secretary mentioned that the project included a modest second floor addition and a link connecting the main house to the carriage house. He said that the Board had looked several times at the project, first recommending reduction in height of the connecting link, then recommended approval. Their opinion was that there was no adverse effect from either public or private space and that the designs were in keeping with the buildings. Mr. Rory Quirk of the Georgetown ANC was recognized by the Chairman as having a procedural question. His point was that there was a difference of opinion on the visibility of the project and a question about if it was in the Commission's jurisdiction, or should be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Review Board. He was asking for the Commission's assistance in clarifying when the Historic Preservation Review Board should review a project, particularly when a project is not fully visible. Mr. Myer pointed out that there is always some element that is not visible from public space. Miss Wolf pointed out that a great deal of time is spent on the visibility question and she supported Mr. Quirk's interest in clarification.

Mr. Atherton then introduced the owner's representative, Mr. Philip Feola who suggested that another review by the Historic Preservation Review Board of a design which has been reviewed and approved by the Georgetown Board would be putting his client in double jeopardy. He objected to the possibility of having the design reviewed by two bodies, with potential difference of opinion. He also stated that he felt the Commission of Fine Arts and the Historic Preservation Review Board had a good relationship and the project had already been reviewed and altered in conformance with the usual process. The Chairman stated that he did not believe the Commission should tell other commissions what to review. He made the point that once a part of a project is visible from public space, then it would be incumbent on the Commission to review the entire project. He added that the Commission should not carve off a piece of a project from the public space point of view and abandon the rest. There was some further discussion between Miss Wolf and Mr. Feola about the legal and practical reality of double review and the possibility of sending things back and forth without perhaps a mutual satisfaction with the design.

Though the Chairman asked to move on to the next subject, Mr. Quirk asked if he might bring up another point. He asked if in the future, there would be a rule of thumb that the Board would review 100

percent of a proposal if it is visible from public space. Mr. Atherton responded, "no." The Chairman said that if any part of a project comes within its jurisdiction, it has the right to review the project as a whole, but may choose not to on a case-by-case basis. Miss Wolf asked for clarification of this, feeling that a formal procedure was desirable. Mr. Porterfield made the point that there was a deliberative element involved, making each project different. He said the Commission's procedure would be, if a part of the project is visible, then the entire project would be reviewed; in deliberation, the Board or the Commission can determine where it puts its attention. With this consensus, the Commission moved on.

3) OG 87-87, 1423 36th Street, N.W. Addition and renovation to the Finnerty residence. The Secretary said that there was no issue to discuss with the ANC since the Board had recommended against the project and the applicants were refining the design.

There being no further discussion or questions about the appendix, it was approved without objection.

E. District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development (Item had been delayed because no representative of the project was present)

CFA 22/May/87-4, 7th and Water Streets, S.W. Proposed new restaurant, revised design. Mr. Carson recalled that the Commission had previously reviewed the designs for this new building on the Washington Channel starting in 1982. He showed the original and the proposed designs side-by-side pointing out that the new proposal was slightly smaller. He indicated that the staff was concerned about the presentation materials being adequate. The Secretary suggested that the overall design had lost some of its original vitality. There was general agreement with these points and the matter was set aside for further coordination with the Department of Housing and Community Development. EXHIBIT F

H. National Park Service, National Capital Region

White House Area Bollards. The Secretary brought up this item which had not been scheduled on the agenda because a bollard mock-up had been installed and visited earlier in the day. He mentioned that the members on the site had preferred tapered bollards with which the Chairman concurred. There was some general discussion about the chain which would connect the bollards as being another unresolved issue. The Chairman thought the size and color should be studied with a further mock-up. He also suggested that a decision could come from the mock-up that no chain would be best. EXHIBIT G

White House Area Paving. The Secretary referred to the Commission's inspection in April as having no recorded decision. The Chairman said that the Commission has preferred Proposal "C". There was some general discussion including the mention that the stone pavers would have a rougher surface than that between the Treasury and the White House,

which had proved quite slick during the Commission's rainy inspection trip. The Secretary added that the preferred tree planting scheme had the trees about eight feet back from the curb. The Chairman directed that the minutes should show approval on that basis. EXHIBIT H

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1:58 p.m.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

2 June 1987

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I just wanted to bring you up to date on the status of the newest design for the Holocaust Memorial.

As you know, the Council abandoned the previous plans and asked another architect, James Freed of I. M. Pei & Partners, to develop a new concept. The Commission reviewed the result of this study at its meeting on 22 May, and I am happy to report we are greatly encouraged by what we saw. Many of our previous concerns appear well on the way to being met, and I believe that with some additional study we will have an acceptable design in the near future.

There is one area of concern in the new concept, and that is the Hall of Remembrance element, which in its present configuration is somewhat oversized and also projects beyond the building line of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. This is, to our mind, inappropriate. The architect has agreed to restudy this aspect of the design and will be presenting a revised version at the Commission's next meeting, scheduled for 19 June.

Also, while no formal action was taken at the May meeting on Annex #3, the consensus of the Commission was that there would be no opposition to its proposed demolition. The Annex does not relate particularly well to The Auditor's Building or to its site on the corner of 15th Street and Independence Avenue, and its removal would certainly enhance the setting of the Holocaust Memorial.

I will be happy to keep you informed on the progress of our deliberations.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Donald P. Hodel
Secretary of the Interior
Washington, D. C. 20240

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT B

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

10 June 1987

Dear Mr. Schubert:

At its meeting on 22 May the Commission reviewed another design for the proposed parking lot on the north side of the main Red Cross headquarters building at 17th and 'E' Streets, N. W. An earlier scheme had been disapproved by the Commission in April of last year. As you know the Commission did not feel it was an appropriate change to the site and recommended that other ways of increasing on-site parking, such as underground garages, be studied as an alternative to surface parking.

Unfortunately the new scheme was not all that different from the earlier proposal. While the parked cars would be obscured somewhat by lowering the lot a few inches and by berming up the surrounding planting and adding a low screen wall, it still represented an inappropriate intrusion into the landscaped stretch of lawn that is such an important element in the setting of the Red Cross Building.

Likewise, the members were not inclined to approve any additional parking on the main entrance drive facing 17th Street. Nor were they enthusiastic about the use of automatic mechanical gates to control access to this drive. The existing parking is bad enough. To double the parking and place gates at either end of the drive confirms once and for all that this is no entrance, but a permanent full-time parking lot.

During our discussions with Mr. Samperton, the architect, we did think it might be worthwhile to take a closer look at your present parking layout behind the E Street building. Perhaps a slightly tighter arrangement might give you at least a few additional spaces. We say this, at the same time cautioning against any further intrusion into the landscaped courtyard to the south of the existing parking. This is truly a very special spot in Washington, and I sense by the remarks made by those in attendance at the meeting that this is a point of view shared by members of the Red Cross staff as well as many others.

As we mentioned in our earlier letter, we sympathize with the needs of an organization like the Red Cross that utilizes volunteer support. It would be nice if sufficient parking were available to them as a perquisite of their good services. Yet there are any number of organizations in this city with a similar situation, and they have simply had to accept the situation for what it is.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard F. Schubert
President
American Red Cross
National Headquarters
Washington, D. C. 20006

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

2 June 1987

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the proposed new seal for the Office of Personnel Management at its 22 May 1987 meeting. I am happy to tell you that it was approved.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Thomas J. Simon, Associate Director
for Administration
U. S. Office of Personnel Management
Washington, D. C. 20415

EXHIBIT D

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT
CFA Meeting 22 May 1987

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 87-83	530 17th Street, N.W. Trustees of the Corcoran Gallery of Art	Proposed addition - Revised Concept

ACTION: Revised Concept design approved for design development. Submit working drawings and material sample for Commission review prior to issuance of permit.

S.L. 87-89	Duke Ellington Bridge, N.W. D.C. Government	Civil Action #0084-86

ACTION: Disapproved: see letter dated 2 June 1987 to Mr. Gary Burch, District of Columbia, Department of Public Works.

O.G. 87-59	1600 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Jack Lyon and John Spivay	Concept

ACTION: Concept design is approved for new two-story building subject to additional detail development of windows on first floor and brick trim. Do not issue permit prior to review and approval of design development and working drawings.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT D-1

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

2 June 1987

Dear Mr. Burch:

Thank you for attending our meeting on 22 May for the purpose of discussing the suicide barriers that have been constructed on the Duke Ellington Bridge over Rock Creek Park at Calvert Street, N. W.

As you know, the Commission had approved the erection of this fence some time ago, although we did so with great reluctance. Our action was based on the hope that the new barrier would prove an effective deterrent to attempted suicides, and that however much the appearance of the bridge would be diminished, we felt it was worth the price to eliminate the problem. Sadly, as we all know, such has not been the case.

In light of its failed intentions, the barrier, in the Commission's opinion, should be removed. It seriously detracts from the appearance of the bridge and, in addition, mars the view of the park and surrounding city as seen from the bridge. In its present state it may even in a fatalistic way serve to draw notice to this troubling problem that has beset the bridge.

It is the Commission's hope that a deterrent can be found that will be truly effective, and that will not affect the appearance of either this or the other historic bridges over Rock Creek.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Gary Burch, Chief
Design and Engineering Division
Bureau of Transportation Construction Services
D. C. Department of Public Works
2000 14th Street, N. W., 5th Floor
Washington, D. C. 20009

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

2 June 1987

Dear Colonel Allison:

At its meeting on 22 May 1987, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and approved the design for a new hay barn on the grounds of Ft. Myer, Virginia. The Barn is both well sited and of an appropriate design and material, which we understand, will be brick to match the adjoining stables.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Col. William F. Allison, Jr.
Deputy Chief of Staff
for Engineering and Housing
Department of the Army
Headquarters, U.S. Army Military
District of Washington
Fort Lesley J. McNair
Washington, D. C. 20319-5050

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT F

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

2 June 1987

Dear Mr. Pohlman:

During its meeting of 22 May 1987, the Commission was shown a revised concept design for the proposed new Specialty Restaurants Corporation building at 7th and Water Streets, Southwest, on land leased from the Redevelopment Land Agency and described as Deck Site C-3-B.

Unfortunately the submission material was insufficient for a complete understanding of the concept proposed. In addition, based on the material available, it would seem that the architectural design has lost some of the character exhibited in the one approved for the site under Shipstead-Luce Act case 86-75.

I believe that under the circumstances it might be useful to have the architects contact the Commission staff. They are well familiar with the problems and I believe they could help get the design back on track.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for 19 June, and we will be happy to reconsider the matter at that time if your agency is ready to resubmit.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert Pohlman
Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community
Development
Government of the District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT G

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

10 June 1987

Dear Jack:

I am writing to confirm the Commission's approval on 22 May 1987 of the tapered design for the security bollards that are to go in front of the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue. It is too bad they have to be so close together, but as reaffirmed at the time of our inspection of the mock-ups, there apparently are no options open on this issue owing to severe security requirements.

There was considerable discussion on whether or not the bollards should be linked together with chain. After the members got back to the Commission's meeting, we talked about it a bit more, and our final consensus was to keep the chain as part of the design, but instead of painting it black as originally intended, we might try a light gray to match the bollards. By doing this we feel the line established by the chain might take the curse off the multiplicity of the so closely spaced bollards by visually tying them all together. Again, the size and type of chain will also be important considerations. This question might be something we should take a look at in the field once the bollards are installed but before the chain is permanently in place.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish, Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT H

4 June 1987

Dear Jack:

Just a note to acknowledge your letter of 22 April and confirm the Commission's views on the proposed improvements for the south sidewalk of Pennsylvania Avenue next to the White House as expressed on its 16 April inspection of the site.

The Commission also preferred Scheme 'C', which utilizes the 2'x2' concrete paver module found on East Executive Avenue with the addition of the offset joints. The finish will be rougher than those already in place which should give a better footing than we experienced during our rainy visit. The additional dark aggregate that would be exposed through this process would help lower the glare a bit.

As you also specify in your letter, the preferred scheme for tree planting is a 6-foot square area with 2-foot granite edges. The tree well will be covered with a black cast-aluminum grate. The trees (Willow Oak, 5-6" caliper) will be located 8' back from the curb line.

We appreciate the arrangements made by your staff in laying out the various tree planting schemes. The Commission members found it very helpful and asked me to pass along their thanks.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Manus J. Fish, Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20242

MEETING:

19 June 1987